REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 27, 2007. Claims 1-22, 28, 29, and 32-34 are presented for examination. Claims 23-27 and 30-31 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 1-22, 28, and 29 have been amended to define more clearly what Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 32-34 have been added to provide Applicant with a more complete scope of protection. Claims 1, 12, 13 and 21 are in independent form. Favorable reconsideration is requested. The canceled claims will not be further addressed herein.

The Office Action objected to Claims 1, 6, 9-12, 19, 20, 23-31 based on a variety of informalities. It appears based on the objections set forth in paragraphs 3-7 that the December 6, 2005 Preliminary Amendment filed in the present application may have been overlooked because certain of the matters objected to were corrected in that Preliminary Amendment. To the extent not already corrected in the December 6, 2005 Preliminary Amendment, the claims have been carefully reviewed and amended as deemed necessary to address the points raised in paragraphs 3-7 of the Office Action. Withdrawal of the objections to the claims is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 1-18 and 26-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims have been carefully reviewed and amended as deemed necessary to address the points raised in paragraph 12 of the Office Action. Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0028559 (*Moreau*).

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over a document entitled "Web Services Description Language (WSDL) V1.2" (*Chinnici et al.*) in view of a document entitled "An Overview of the MPEG-7 Description Definition Language (DDL) Proposals" (*Hunter et al.*).

Claims 14-18, 21-24, 26, 28, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Moreau* in view of *Hunter et al.*

As shown above, Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 12, 13 and 21 in terms that more clearly define what is regarded as the invention. Applicant submits that these amended independent claims, together with the remaining claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

Claim 13 is directed to a method of validating a multimedia document when a service offered by a server in a communication network is implemented, wherein the service is associated with a service description document. The method includes the steps of: (1) acquiring the multimedia document; (2) extracting a description of abstract constraints associated with a binary multimedia document from the service description document; (3) extracting a content description associated with the multimedia document; (4) comparing the content description and the description of the abstract constraints extracted from the service description document; and (5) implementing the service on the multimedia document, if the content description satisfies the abstract constraints.

Among other notable features of Claim 13 is that the method includes extracting a description of abstract constraints associated with a binary multimedia document from the service description document, extracting a content description associated with the

multimedia document, and comparing the content description and the description of the abstract constraints extracted from the service description document. By virtue of the features recited in Claim 13, a server is able to validate a multimedia document prior to implementing a requested service.

For example, as shown in paragraph 147, a service description document may include a plurality of abstract constraints, two of which may define a range of allowable image widths and one of which may require that the image is a grayscale image.[1] A minimum image width is defined as 0 and a maximum image width is defined as 640. Upon receiving a request to perform a service on a multimedia document, a content description associated with the multimedia document is extracted and compared to the abstract constraints. If the content description of the color domain format indicates a grayscale image and the content description of the image width satisfies the image width abstract constraints, *e.g.,* has a value of 320, then the service is implemented on the multimedia document. On the other hand, if the content description of the color domain format does not indicate a grayscale image, or if the content description of the image width does not satisfy the abstract constraints, *e.g.,* has a value of 650, then the service is not implemented on the multimedia document.

Moreau relates to a method of analyzing a document represented in a markup language. *Moreau* discusses attaching a predefined tag and a set of data to a document represented in a markup language. The tag is parsed and a content length of the data is obtained, which facilitates processing of the data, without parsing the data. Nothing has been found in

---

1/It is to be understood, of course, that the claim scope is not limited by the details of the described embodiments, which are referred to only to facilitate explanation.

14

Moreau that would teach or suggest "extracting a description of abstract constraints associated with a binary multimedia document from the service description document; extracting a content description associated with the multimedia document" and "comparing the content description and the description of the abstract constraint extracted from the service description document," as recited in Claim 13.

The Office Action cites paragraphs 16-17, as disclosing the step of extracting a description of an abstract constraint recited in Claim 13. Applicant disagrees. The cited passage merely discusses, among other things, that a predefined tag associated with a content length attribute is detected, and that a value of the content length attribute is read. *Moreau* also discusses, in paragraph 42, that data is processed according to an identified value of a predefined tag. Apparently, the data is processed according to the identified value of the predefined tag without determining whether the identified value is valid by comparing the identified value to a constraint.

Moreover, nothing has been found in *Moreau* that would teach or suggest a "service description document" much less "comparing the content description and the description of the abstract constraint extracted from the service description document," as recited in Claim 13.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 13 is not anticipated by *Moreau*.

The disclosures of *Chinnici et al.* and *Hunter et al.* do not remedy the deficiencies of *Moreau*.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference

against Claim .

Independent Claims 1, 12, 21, 28, and 29 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 13 and therefore are also believed to be patentable over *Moreau*, *Chinnici et al.*, and *Hunter et al.*

Applicant submits that a combination of *Moreau*, *Chinnici et al.*, and *Hunter et al.*, assuming such combination would even be permissible, would fail to teach or suggest "comparing the content description and the description of the abstract constraint extracted from the service description document," as recited in independent Claims 1, 12 and 21.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 1, 12, 21, 28, and 29 are patentable over the cited art, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual consideration or reconsideration, as the case may be, of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jennifer A. Reda/
Jennifer A. Reda
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 57,840

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 1995572v1